

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messing et al (US Patent 6,466,618) in view of Honey et al (US Patent 5,917,533).

Claims 2-4, 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, claim 2 has been cancelled, and the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 1 instead of claim 2. This is the logical equivalent of rewriting the allowable claims in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Consequently, all the remaining claims are now allowable, since they all depend from an allowable base claim.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon does not appear to present an impediment to the patentability of the present invention.

Appl. No. 10/036,644
Amdt. dated February 04, 2005
Reply to Office action of December 01, 2004

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to phone the undersigned attorney to further the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2/4/05



Russ Weinzimmer
Registration No. 36,717
Attorney for Applicants

P.O. Box 862
Wilton, NH 03086

Tel: 603-654-5670
Fax: 603-654-3556